

REMARKS

Reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims, in view of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated June 6, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-22, 25, and 27-31, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Leung (U.S. Patent No. 6,501,746).

At the outset, Applicants point out the Examiner has failed to address all pending claims in his Office Action of June 6, 2008. Particularly, the Examiner has failed to address Applicants' claims 12 and 23 in the Office Action.

By this Amendment, claims 2-7, 9-12, 14-23, 25, and 27-30 have been amended. Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced. As such, claims 1-7, 9-23, 25, and 27-31 are presented for examination of which claims 1, 13, 25, and 31 are independent.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), for the reasons presented below.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

As indicated above, independent claim 1 positively recites, *inter alia*, the features: creating at least one ***database comprising subscriber data***, from which there is ***functional connection to the bearer network***, said subscriber data being ***similar to the data stored in a subscriber application comprised by the terminal***, the subscriber data including authentication information.

One aspect of Applicants' invention relates to providing of telecommunication services by creating a database that is in functional connection with a bearer network, wherein the database comprises subscriber data that is similar to the data stored in a subscriber application (e.g., UMTS Subscriber Identity Module application) comprised by a terminal. Thus, per various embodiments of Applicants' invention, subscriber data that was conventionally only stored in the subscriber application comprised by the terminal, is stored in a database that is in functional connection with the bearer network. The subscriber data stored in the database is used to provide the terminal with telecommunication services. Applicants' as-filed Specification, at paragraphs 15-18 and 26-28, describes various problems

with conventional systems and the advantages obtained by the embodiments of Applicants' invention.

By contrast, Leung relates to IP address assignment in a Mobile IP system. In particular, Leung relates to assigning an IP address to a mobile node during registration which may be accomplished by mapping a mobile node ID associated with the mobile node to an assigned IP address. A registration request may be sent by the mobile node to a Home Agent. Once an IP address is assigned to the mobile node, the IP address may be transferred to the mobile node in a registration reply composed by the Home Agent.

Assuming *arguendo*, that Leung's Home Agent is analogous to Applicants' bearer network (though Applicants do not concede this), there is absolutely no disclosure in Leung relating to a database comprising subscriber data, much less of the database being in functional connection with the Home Agent (alleged bearer network).

The Examiner erroneously alleges that column 6, line 65- column 7, line 20 of Leung discloses these features of Applicants' pending claims. Applicants strenuously disagree. The citations relied upon by the Examiner merely describe how a registration request is composed by the mobile node (that sends the registration request via a foreign agent to the Home Agent). In fact, there is no mention in the citations relied upon by the Examiner or the Leung reference in its entirety of creating at least one ***database comprising subscriber data***, from which there is ***functional connection to the bearer network***, as recited by Applicants' claim 1.

Moreover, Leung further fails to disclose that the subscriber data in the database is ***similar to the data stored in a subscriber application comprised by the terminal*** and that the subscriber data includes authentication information, also as required by Applicants' claim 1.

Applicants further submit that since Leung fails to disclose a database comprising subscriber data, as mentioned above, Leung also fails to disclose the various other claimed features of Applicants' claim 1 that relate to the use of the subscriber database and subscriber data.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Leung fails to disclose the claimed combination of elements recited by claim 1. As such, claim 1 is clearly patentable. And, because claims 2-7, and 9-12 depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly, claims

2-7, and 9-12 are patentable at least by virtue of dependency as well as for their additional recitations. Accordingly, the immediate withdrawal of the prior art rejections of claims 1-7, and 9-12 is respectfully requested.

With regard to the remaining claims, independent claims 13, 25, and 31 recite similar patentable features as claim 1, so claims 13, 25, and 31 are also patentable for the reasons presented relative to claim 1. And, because claims 14-23, and 27-30 depend from claims 13 and 25, respectively, claims 14-23, and 27-30 are patentable at least by virtue of dependency as well as for their additional recitations. Accordingly, the immediate withdrawal of the prior art rejections of claims 13-23, 25, and 27-31 is respectfully requested.

228

373
12

CONCLUSION

All matters having been addressed and in view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicants submit that the entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 as the claim changes: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not require any further consideration as the changes incorporate, in one form or another, features that should have been already searched; and (c) places the application in better form for an Appeal, should an Appeal be necessary.

Applicants' representative remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP
SHAW PITTMAN LLP

By: 

E. R. HERNANDEZ
Reg. No. 47641
Tel. No. 703.770.7788
Fax No. 703.770.7901

Date: July 31, 2008
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900